DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 131 SP 005 026

AUTHOR	Sand, Ole
TITLE	On Staying Awake: Talks With Teachers.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Center for the Study of Instruction.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. (paperbound, $1.25, clothbound, $2.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development, *Educational Change, *Educational Philosophy, Humanities, Teacher Responsibility, *Teacher Role, *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

These five essays explore curriculum reform, the future of America's schools, inquiry-directed education, rights and responsibilities, and the roles of teachers and schools in an age of confrontation. The central theme is the role of the organized profession in educational change. In the final analysis it is the students, the teachers, and the parents all working together who will make the difference. It is they who will make education an exciting and alive process, and without whom the theories and proposals, however important, mean nothing. "On Staying Awake" stresses the importance of inquiry as the fundamental principle of learning and the need for the teacher to retain a sense of awe at the ability of the human mind. "Putting First Things Last" deals with the tendency to confuse social engineering with education and points to the danger of practice without theory. "In Search of a New Bird" asks for a new symbol of American education to replace the parrot and for freedom from the rigidities of the present educational structure. "How Much Does Gray Matter?" is a plea for more humanity and imagination, both in the school environment and in the curriculum content. "Entrances and Exits" touches in some of the issues and challenges facing the schools in the 70's. This is one of several volumes in the preliminary series of the school for the 70's program. (MBM)

ED051131

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ON STAYING AWAKE: TALKS WITH TEACHERS

Ole Sand
Director
NEA Center for the Study of Instruction

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's

PRELIMINARY SERIES

Published by the National Education Association
Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI)

1

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright © 1970
National Education Association

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 70-137430

Single copy: paperbound, $1.25 (Stock No. 381-11954); clothbound, $2.25 (Stock No. 381-11956). Discounts on quantity orders: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent. All orders must be prepaid except for those on official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Order from Publications-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

CONTENTS

Foreword 1

Acknowledgments 3

About the Author 4

Essay 1.
On Staying Awake 5

Essay 2.
Putting First Things Last 17

Essay 3.
In Search of a New Bird 29

Essay 4.
How Much Does Gray Matter? 39

Essay 5.
Entrances and Exits 51

FOREWORD

"There is a tradition in speeches," John Kenneth Galbraith once said, "which holds that the speech itself is therapeutic. The benefit lies in the articulation. No ensuing action is required or even expected."

For more than ten years as director of the National Education Association's Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI), Ole Sand has flaunted that tradition. He has taken his message of educational reform on the roast beef and convention hall circuit and presented it to thousands of American teachers. He has woven theory and practice, prediction and advice, tradition and current problems into an effective call for educational action. He has taken the lead to work with teachers on the firing line to help them make things happen, to help them become the agents rather than the victims of change.

This book is a collection of essays drawn from those speeches. It is the essence of hundreds of Sand's "talks with teachers," during which they inevitably stay awake.

In five essays—or, if you wish, "talks"—Sand explores curriculum reform, the future of America's schools, inquiry-directed education, rights and responsibilities, and the roles of teachers and schools in an age of confrontation. Sand's understanding of America's problems is obvious. His proposals for education's role in helping solve those problems are well founded. The role of the organized profession in educational change is his central theme. He insists that in the final analysis, it is the students, the teachers, and the parents all working together who will make the difference. It is the students, the teachers, and the parents who will make the change. It is they who will make education an exciting and alive process. The theories and proposals are important. But without teachers, students, and parents working together

they mean nothing. This book, like Sand's speeches, is, then, a call to action. It is a beginning—not an end.

On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers is one of several volumes in the Preliminary Series of the SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's program.

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's is a major publication and action program of the NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction. The program has three parts. The first is a comprehensive, single-volume report, with accompanying multimedia and action programs addressed to all members of the profession and the public. The second, of which this book is a part, is a Preliminary Series focused on critical issues. The third is an Auxiliary Series prepared primarily for curriculum specialists and university and school researchers. The entire SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's program is more than just a series of books. It underlines anew the NEA's continuing, unequivocal, and major commitment to promote instructional improvement in the light of new priorities and imperatives.

Helen Bain
President
National Education Association
September 1970

5a

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This collection of essays was made possible by the cooperation of many people. The persistence and enthusiasm of my colleagues at CSI have been the single most important supporting force. Although some of them are supported by special project funds, I am grateful to all of them: Gary Griffin, Fred Husmann, Lois Karasik, Robert Martin, Robert McClure, Frances Quinto, and Brennan Rash. Special mention should be made of Brennan Rash, who assisted in the final editing.

I also want to express my appreciation to all of my other coworkers at the NEA, especially Lawrence G. Derthick. Others who have helped in this enterprise include Rev. Joseph Devlin, Warren T. Greenleaf, Paul Houts, Edward J. Meade, Jr., David Swanston, Ralph W. Tyler, and Margie Weld. Many of the ideas in these essays already have appeared in such journals as *Today's Education*, *The National Elementary Principal*, and the *Music Educators Journal*. I am grateful to their editors and to the Pitman Publishing Company which gave me permission to reproduce portions of this text that already have appeared in my chapter, "What To Teach—and How," in *High School 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Secondary Education*, edited by Alvin C. Eurich.

Most important of all are the teachers and students of this country, from whom I have learned so much during these ten years in which I have had the privilege of teaching on "the nation as my campus."

Ole Sand
Director
Center for the Study of Instruction
National Education Association
September 1970

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

At age 18, in the back country of his home state of Minnesota, Ole Sand and teaching got together. His first classroom was a one-room school. Since those days his experience has broadened to encompass the entire United States and a good part of the rest of the world. He started teaching grades 1 through 8 and ended up teaching teachers, principals, other educators, the public, and always the students.

Following three years as a Naval officer in World War II, Sand received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Chicago. From 1948 to 1960 he was professor of education and, during the last three of these years, chairman of the Department of Elementary Education at Wayne State University, Detroit. He joined the staff of the National Education Association in 1960 as director of its Project on Instruction.

A visiting professor at numerous universities including Wisconsin, Washington, California-Berkeley, Stanford, and Harvard, Sand has served as a consultant to the U.S. Office of Education and the Ford Foundation. In 1966 he was a consultant for the Office of Overseas Schools of the U.S. Department of State on a five-week tour of schools in the Far East. As this book goes to press, he is preparing for a second consultation for the State Department in Kampala, Uganda. He worked with colleagues in England and Canada to coordinate a series of international curriculum conferences, including the 1967 and 1969 conferences in Oxford, England, and Lake Mohonk, New York.

A popular and witty speaker, he is also widely published in educational journals. His three-volume report on nursing education is still in demand by curriculum students and administrators.

In short, Sand's career has been dedicated to one thing: keeping people awake—keeping them awake for new ideas, for new methods, for new possibilities.

Essay 1
On Staying Awake

One of the major problems in promoting educational improvement is rescuing it from the hyphenated and multisyllabic verbiage that so often cloaks good ideas in linguistic obscurity. As this little homily goes to press, the mini, the maxi, and the midi are contending for the favor of American women. Sticking doggedly with this fashion metaphor and trying to translate it into terms pertinent to education, I would say that the NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction definitely opts for the mini: the simpler, the better. Everybody in education these days is in favor of "inquiry-directed learning," "a cognitive approach," "individually-prescribed instruction," and "learner-centered teaching." Those are all good ideas and they deserve to be put to work. Step A in bridging the gap between educational theory and educational practice, however, is figuring out what all those words mean.

Instead of trying to explain them one by one, I would like to try to suggest their meaning and their implications for instruction in the 1970's as a way of offering a view of teaching as mental attitude rather than pedagogical procedure. By way of introduction, I would like to call upon a gentleman named Dwight MacDonald.

Everyone has his own enthusiasms in reading, of course, and I hesitate to foist upon others those authors whom I have found good company over the years. Indeed, it strikes me that one of our major errors in teaching literature is that we present our students with required reading lists, implying that everybody from Homer to J. D. Salinger has earned a niche of precisely the same size in the literary Hall of Fame. We forget that one's response to literature is an intensely personal thing and that while there is good reason to compel a student to read the so-called classics, we make a mistake if we suggest that unless a student likes them all, there is something wrong with him. How refreshing it would be, I think, for a teacher to say, "Well, now, we have all read *Portrait of a Lady*. I would like to open the discussion by stating that I find Henry James a crashing bore."

What I intended to say before that small digression was that those who have not looked into Dwight MacDonald might find it amusing to do so. In one of his early books, he described how he fought his way up from anonymity to comparative fame. It was a typical Horatio Alger story of thrift and persistence in the face of constant discouragement. MacDonald started out as an executive trainee with Macy's, then went to work for Henry Luce at *Fortune* Magazine. Soon after that, he writes, his wife inherited a large sum of money, and from that point on, MacDonald did precisely what he pleased.

MacDonald's good luck since he left *Fortune* has enabled him to take genteel, scholarly pokes at many aspects of the American Establishment. He has, at various times, ridiculed James Gould Cozzens, structural linguistics, the reading habits of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower, and—most blasphemous of all—the Great Books. He reviewed the third edition of Webster's Dictionary in the *New Yorker* Magazine, March 10, 1962. In one of his essays, entitled "The Triumph of the Fact," he denounces the American fascination for weights and measures as against analysis, appreciation, and judgment:

> We are obsessed with techniques, hagridden by Facts, in love with information. Our popular novelists must tell us about the historical and professional backgrounds of their puppets; our press lords make millions by giving us this day our daily fact; our scholars—or, more accurately, our research administrators—erect pyramids of data to cover the corpse of a stillborn idea; our way of "following" a sport is to amass an extraordinary amount of data about batting averages, past performances, yards gained, etc., so that many Americans who cannot read without moving their lips have a fund of sports scholarship that would stagger Lord Acton; our politicians are mostly former lawyers, a profession where the manipulation of Facts is of first importance; we are brought up according to Spock, Gesell and the other Aristotles of child care; we make love according to the best manuals of sexual techniques; and before we die we brief our wives with Donald I. Rogers' *Teach Your Wife to be a Widow*.[1]

MacDonald follows this broad indictment with a bill of particulars assembled from Walter Winchell, John Gunther, George Gallup, Edgar Allan Poe, and the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

It makes interesting reading, but you might logically wonder whether it has any relationship to teaching.

It does, I believe, because of the nature of education in general and the nature of education for the 1970's in particular.

By "education in general" I mean the nature of learning and, hence, the nature of teaching. How do people learn? And how does one human being, the teacher, go about helping another human being, the student, develop that vaguely defined capacity we regard as the product of education?

Jerome Bruner has tackled this question in *Toward a Theory of Instruction.*[2] And so, years earlier, did John Dewey in *How We Think*[3] and Charles Hubbard Judd in *The Psychology of High-School Subjects.*[4] (It occurs to me at this point that, for a man who is skeptical of reading lists, I am doing an impressive job of assembling one here.) At any rate, Dewey and Judd ("translated" by Bruner) and other sleuths on the cognitive scene have stressed the importance of inquiry over memory in the learning process. MacDonald bemoans the triumph of the fact; the inquiry school agrees and suggests a method for triumphing over the fact in education.

Their arguments gain weight because of a phenomenon that our professional and popular magazines have dissected to the point of tedium: "the knowledge explosion." The sciences assembled are simply turning up more new information than any human can hope to assimilate in a lifetime of learning.

Teachers have probably all heard this song before. *Inquiry* is one of the "in" words in education today, and if a speaker assembles enough of the others—*relevance, meaningful, involvement,* etc.—he can make 30 minutes of highly acceptable noise without saying a thing. What does inquiry mean?

I find it easiest to take a cue from good teachers of the humanities as I strive to outline instruction based on inquiry. And since I have not such a teacher handy at the moment, I will quote one of the most extraordinary lessons about literature I ever received, delivered by an extraordinary teacher whom I have never met.

Several years ago, while loitering in an airport between planes, I picked up a paperback volume entitled *Visions and Revisions in Modern American Literary Criticism.* The title alone made me blanch, of course. All I really wanted was a potboiler about espionage in Sumatra or somewhere, 90 minutes of escape suitably tricked out with exotic girls and shots in the night. At that time, however, I was so conscious of being an Educator with a capital

"E" that I lacked the courage to admit, even to myself, that occasionally I prefer enjoyable trash to Good Reading.

I was lucky. I found in that ponderously titled book one of the most intriguing detective stories I have ever read. Its title was "Fallen from Time." Written by a gentleman named Philip Young, it begins this way:

> Washington Irving is reported to have spent a June evening in 1818 talking with his brother-in-law about the old days in Sleepy Hollow. Melancholy of late, the writer was pleased to find himself laughing. Suddenly he got up and went to his room. By morning he had the manuscript of the first and most famous American short story, and his best single claim to a permanent reputation.[5]

If I tell you that the story was about a henpecked husband who went off into the Catskills shooting squirrels, saw some oddly dressed little men rolling balls that made a sound like thunder, and then fell asleep for 20 years, you will know that the story is the tale of Rip Van Winkle.

But after summarizing the tale for the reader, Young goes to work. He points out that back in 1496, Erasmus recounted the myth of a Greek named Epimenides who slept for 57 years. And another story has seven early Christians, natives of Ephesus, hiding in a mountain to escape persecution by the Roman emperor Decius; they slept for 360 years. That story, with some alterations, appears also in the Mohammedan Koran. The Babylonian Talmud describes how a teacher named Honi the Circle-Drawer falls asleep for 70 years. And the Chinese have a story of Wang Chih who comes upon some elders playing chess in a mountain grotto, falls asleep, and does not return for centuries.

Why is it, Young wonders, that this notion of a man's sleeping for long periods has such a hold on the human imagination? Why does it appear in so many literatures, widely separated in place and time? There are many dozens of fables in Aesop, Hans Christian Andersen, the Brothers Grimm; with all that competition, why do we so readily identify Rip Van Winkle? Clearly Irving did more than write a good yarn; he wrote some kind of parable in which, perhaps subconsciously, we see ourselves. "Thanks to Irving," Young writes, "the thunder Rip heard is still rolling out of the Catskills. And it is pregnant thunder, charged

with meaning. Perhaps it is time someone tried to make out what it has to say." [6]

Young takes the task upon himself, and after 20 more pages of scholarly detective work, he concludes that our attraction to Rip Van Winkle stems from a kind of conflict between our common desire never to grow up, never to die, and our adult recognition that each of us shall assuredly do so.

"And this is not just our own hidden childishness," Young continues. "It is all our own lost lives and roles, the lives and roles that once seemed possible and are possible no more. In twenty years all springs are over. . . . To translate what the thunder meant, to confront the meaning of life and the future of all our childish selves, we all have to go into our own mountains." [7]

Young's essay struck me as an extraordinary piece of critical writing, and not least of all because it was fun to read. (Sometimes I think we equate the worth of a piece of professional writing with its difficulty. "This is such dreary reading," we think to ourselves, "it *must* be important.")

Beyond this personal reaction, however, I feel that this essay suggests what it is we are after in striving to define and understand inquiry as the principle for a new kind of teaching. No student with the capacity to understand that essay, I feel, would ever be quite the same again. And perhaps no teacher of literature would, either, for this essay casts some light on those eternal human questions that give literature its weight and joy.

It is so easy in teaching Shakespeare, for example, to misconstrue the purpose of the course as making sure that students read all the assigned plays. And it is so easy to find out if they *have*. Simply draft a test that asks them, Who said, "The quality of mercy is not strained"? Who said, "Absent thee from felicity awhile"? Who said, "Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look"? If the student gives the right answers, we mark him down as *knowing* Shakespeare.

Nonsense! Thomas Wolfe once wrote a story called, "Only the Dead Know Brooklyn." Perhaps only the dead know Shakespeare. For knowing Shakespeare—if such a thing is possible—has nothing to do with who said what. Knowing Shakespeare is a personal process. Like blowing one's nose, it cannot be done by proxy. In the humanities, we must understand and define the nature of the educational experience toward which we hope to guide students. We cannot, on the one hand, have that experience for them; nor can we accept dates, names, and a mental facility for associ-

13 81

ating quotations with characters as proof that the student has had the experience. A year in Europe should produce more than souvenirs; so should a year with Shakespeare.

Thus, the starting point of learning based on inquiry is a definition—not a definition of the curriculum, but a definition of what it is we want to happen to the student. Or, more accurately, it is a definition of what the student must make happen for himself. Generally speaking, we want to convey to him the nature of the literary or historical or scientific experience, and the set of facts or the play or the laboratory experiment is in itself quite subsidiary to this larger goal.

What, for example, is the root of the human motivation that led Gibbon and Spengler and Toynbee to devote their lives to history? Simply to recount what occurred? A hundred scholarly journalists have done that, and only specialists care what they said. The great historians intended much more: to place what happened in some kind of framework of understanding, to develop a theory of history, to show that man's long march from the primeval caves was not just a collection of happenings, but a series of interrelated events. If a student cannot remember whether the Assyrians preceded the Babylonians or vice versa, he can look both up in an encyclopedia. But if at some sudden, priceless moment in his education he perceives that what the Committees of Correspondence did to King George in 1775 was a logical outgrowth of what the barons at Runnymede did to King John in 1215, he has grasped the nature of historical inquiry. His curiosity has been aroused, his mind jostled, his understanding nudged; in a small or large way he has become a historian, and all the dates he failed to memorize are not one-tenth as important as the relationships he is now capable of investigating for himself.

I have stressed the humanities because I am more comfortable talking about them. I gave up on science decades ago, when my algebra teacher had the effrontery to state that "X to the zero power equals one." (It must be obvious to any sane man that this is the sheerest poppycock.) I became reconciled to science only recently. But I cannot help wondering whether many students are not cheated of a portion of their intellectual birthright by teachers who confuse information about science with science itself—whether, in sum, Fact has not triumphed over understanding in this sphere also.

Take the Pythagorean theorem: in a right triangle, the hypotenuse squared equals the sum of the other two sides squared.

The theorem is easy to memorize and manipulate, so I suppose most students master it.

But so what? If the process stops there, what has been learned? I cannot speak for anyone else, but I must confess that only rarely have I been asked to roll up my sleeves and put the old Pythagorean theorem to work. Rarely have I been called upon to demonstrate that triangle ABC is congruent with A′B′C′—or even to guess whether they were nodding acquaintances.

I purposely overstate the case. These nasty remarks about the utility of the Pythagorean theorem are, of course, beside the point. For in geometry we are dealing not with a set of handy rules for appraising planes, solids, and parallelograms, but with the nature of the mathematical endeavor: the notion that from the bewildering variety of physical objects around us, we can abstract such concepts as *length* and *number, area* and *volume;* that through the process of mathematics we can impose order and understanding upon some aspects of our apparently chaotic world; and that the human mind takes pleasure and delight in such understanding.

The human mind takes pleasure in *all* understanding. I think that we accept too easily the idea that some students are "good" in English, while others are "good" in geometry. While there are undeniable differences in the facility with which students take to different subjects, perhaps we write off too soon the young artist's capacity for enjoying physics and the young scientist's capacity for enjoying Latin. If we ever plumb the depths of the human learning process, I suspect we will find that at the bottom it is one experience; that a pleasure in philosophy or literature is closely related to a pleasure in chemistry or economics. We will perceive that Einstein's intellectual journey ending in $E=mc^2$ is related to Charles Darwin's curiosity about the variety of sparrows on a single South American island, and that both are related to Shakespeare's analysis of the paradoxical nature of lust in Sonnet 129. In each case we are dealing with the human striving to understand —and what each mind found out is perhaps less important than why each mind wanted to understand.

This is how I conceive of inquiry as the fundamental principle for learning. It is entirely possible for a student to divide a poem up into anapests, dactyls, and trochees without ever enjoying the poem or caring to read another as long as he lives. But if we somehow manage to convey to that student the realization that this poet was not always embalmed in an anthology—that he was

not just an arty fellow, but was grappling with such matters as human love and human hate, human hope and human despair—we have done something far more important than train him to spot an iambic pentameter from 30 yards away. We have triumphed over Fact. We have put data and technique where they belong and ransomed the unique dignity and splendor of the human understanding from captivity in semester hours, courses, subjects, and grades.

New approaches toward organizing schools and classrooms will help us to achieve a triumph over Fact; however no model or organization nor any teaching devices ever likely to be invented can serve as a substitute for that single, most essential element, the teacher. If the teacher is to direct learning toward inquiry, he must himself remain an inquirer. He must manage to retain a sense of awe at the ability of the human mind to unravel the material and immaterial puzzles of our existence. He must remain a learner all his life, so that his continuing experience will enable him to anticipate the sometimes slow, sometimes rapid progress his students must make if they are to follow him in learning today and surpass him tomorrow.

This process is beyond the capacity of overhead projectors, nongraded classes, and in-service institutes to confer. The teacher must go into himself to determine whether the tiny but constantly tapping hammer of daily routine has chipped away that sense of dedication to learning and to helping others learn that made him choose this profession over another. He must devise ways to renew himself and must refuse to allow the human process of growing old to prevent him from remaining young. While constantly maturing as a person and as a professional, he must constantly see his professional duties through new eyes.

It is one thing for a teacher to be elderly; it is quite another for a teacher to be obsolete, since the most powerful obsolescence comes from within, not from without.

If we are to keep this enemy at bay, we must—like Rip Van Winkle—continue to wonder what the thunder on the mountaintop has to say. Unlike Rip, however, after we have found out, we must stay awake.

FOOTNOTES

[1] MacDonald, Dwight. "The Triumph of Fact." *Against the American Grain.* New York: Random House, 1962. pp. 393-94.

[2] Bruner, Jerome. *Toward a Theory of Instruction.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

[3] Dewey, John. *How We Think.* Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1933.

[4] Judd, Charles Hubbard. *The Psychology of High-School Subjects.* Boston: Ginn and Co., 1915.

[5] Young, Philip. "Fallen from Time." *Visions and Revisions in Modern American Literary Criticism.* New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1962. p. 284.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.* p. 308.

17 of

Essay 2
Putting First Things Last

Since World War II, the problems confronting American society have become more numerous, more complex, and more urgent. In 1966, for example, John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, listed what he considered to be the country's ten most pressing problems. Of the ten, seven would have warranted practically no notice 20 years ago, but each is crucial in 1970.

Gardner's list included these crisis areas: peace, the developing nations, population control, equality, adequate education, the cities, the natural environment, problems of government, and the relationship of the individual to society.[1] None of the difficulties Gardner cited bloomed overnight. Each one developed over the years and became more urgent with prolonged inaction. And, as each of the problems grew, educators attempted to alter the nation's schools to make them more responsive.

But we should not forget John Goodlad's admonishment that "education is a *long time process of changing the behavior of human beings.* Education is *not* bringing about the immediate improvement in roads, slums, jobs, housing and all the rest."[2] One reason President Johnson's great contributions to public education did not bring the continuing congressional action required is that educators confused social engineering with education and promised immediate social results.

As a result, there has been ceaseless activity in education since World War II. Thousands of curriculum-reform schemes have been advanced. But the degree of progress the movement and the schemes have brought is open to considerable question.

Has the movement resulted in a more systematic or orderly way of viewing existing knowledge? Has it tended to generate new avenues of study? Has it assisted in explaining the complex interrelationships of the various components that make up the field? The answer, in most instances, is no. In fact, the movement has done few of these things. It has done little because there is

a vacuum in curricular rationales (and in administration) that allows any agency or person to invent any process or product and then sell it in the market place. This will continue to be the case until serious efforts are made to fit existing efforts into an overall design. As a result of this vacuum, schools are left in a position not unlike the passengers on an airplane that was badly off its course. "We're lost," the pilot announced, "but we're making good time."

There is a great need in education in the United States, and most likely in other countries, to have adequately tested theoretical bases and conceptual frameworks to use in assessing curricular innovations. While we insist that the heart of the matter is effective practice and action, we *are* aware that, although thought without action is futile, action without thought is fatal. Certainly theory without practice is empty, but practice without theory is blind.

A curriculum rationale developed by Ralph Tyler shows promise as one framework to pursue in meeting this urgent need. The basic ideas include identifying what children and youth need to learn to live personally satisfying and socially significant lives in a constantly changing world, selecting learning opportunities that enable students to learn what they need to learn, organizing these learnings in such a way that they are both effective and efficient, and carefully appraising the program to see how effective it has been and to what extent students have learned what they needed to learn.[3]

Real curriculum reform in the 70's also must place emphasis on philosophy, on clear objectives consistent with the philosophy, and on a strategy for change that logically and morally contributes to the objectives. And, obviously, there should be an overall design that includes all the components and their relationships, even though we are suspicious of overemphasizing the "systems approach" of engineering. PPBS is fashionable and may lead to better efficiency, but it must be kept in mind that people are more important than programs.

Philosophy is dedicated to a systematic consideration of the major issues and questions within a society. A society need not employ a philosophy to resolve its problems, but as Lawrence Cremin states, ". . . philosophical problems do not resolve themselves by being ignored, and it will do Americans little good to quicken their pace in education if they do not know where they are going."[4]

An essay in *Time* Magazine suggested:

> There is an old saying that philosophy bakes no bread. It is perhaps equally true that no bread would ever have been baked without philosophy. For the act of baking implies a decision on the philosophical question of whether life is worthwhile at all. Bakers may not have often asked themselves the question in so many words. But philosophy traditionally has been nothing less than the attempt to ask and answer, in a formal and disciplined way, the great questions of life that ordinary men put to themselves in reflective moments.[5]

The point, again, is that practice without the theory to guide it is blind. Theory without the test of practice is empty. Theory and practice should illuminate each other. In order to determine the kind of education we consider best, we must define the kind of person we want education to help produce.

The question then is what kind of person do we want? What are our goals for education? William Menninger gives eight characteristics education might nurture: the capacity to change; the abandonment of solutions learned in childhood; the ability to accept frustration for future gain—compromising rather than fleeing or fighting; the ability to meet stress without acquiring disabling symptoms; the ability to find more satisfaction in giving than in receiving—a reversal of the infant role, which was only demands; the ability to relate to people in a consistent manner rather than switching from friendliness today to hostility tomorrow; the ability to direct one's hostile energy into constructive outlets; the capacity to love, which is the only neutralizer of hate.[6] The kind of change we want to make in human beings—the kind of person we want—is an understandable way to define objectives.

Now, with a framework, a philosophy, and a set of goals in mind, let's turn to the other questions in curriculum innovation. Cooperative curriculum planning has at least two interrelated essential facets: understanding of substantive tasks to be done and skill in working together to accomplish the tasks.

First, what are the essential substantive elements in curriculum change? What jobs need attention to assure the worth of curriculum innovation in practice? Let me suggest ten based on the Tyler rationale: study the learner; study contemporary society; study new developments in the disciplines and promising innovations in teaching and learning; formulate and use a credo

of beliefs; use a defensible theory of learning in making your decisions; formulate clear objectives with emphasis on behavioral change and content; plan creative learning opportunities; select appropriate instructional materials; organize learning opportunities to provide for continuity, sequence, and integration; and evaluate the extent to which each individual attains the objectives and the extent to which the means were effective in attaining the ends.[7]

These ten important jobs need not be tackled in any particular sequence. The initial point of attack depends upon the concerns of the faculty, the students, and the community; upon the problems already identified; upon available data; and the like. The instructional program may be improved by beginning at any point, providing all ten jobs are eventually completed. Each task requires the united efforts of teachers and students, with the assistance of scholars and laymen, individual schools, school systems, universities, industrial and labor groups, state agencies, and—probably most important of all—professional associations.

The issues of priorities, balance, and content selection are focal points of the curriculum reform movement. In a historical context, the issues are clear, and five eras of curriculum reform can be identified. Goodlad has discussed these in considerable detail.[8]

For example, in the 30's, during the heyday of progressive education, the *child* was the primary focus. In the 40's, when we were engaged in a great world war, the curriculum was *society*-centered. In the 50's and 60's the scholars were in the saddle, and the curriculum was primarily subject- or *discipline*-centered. Now, as we move into the 70's, we will most likely be concerned with the *total* curriculum for all children. Hopefully, by the 80's we will have a truly *humanistic* curriculum.

Another way to look at the reform movement of the past decade is to say that Phase One is over. It focused on academic scholarship, on the structure of separate disciplines, on comprehensive packages of instructional materials, and on in-service training of teachers.

The results of the first phase of the reform movement should have created schools characterized, according to Goodlad, by the following:

> Rather clear statements of institutional objectives, stated in behavioral terms; instructional emphasis on learning how to learn, on long-term structural elements of subject matter rather than isolated bits and pieces; multi-media learning packages in

every classroom, designed with concern for the integrity of the content as well as for intrinsic appeal for the students; extensive instructional recognition of individual differences, reflected in evaluation procedures, and expectations for students; considerable use of basic principles of group dynamics, human interaction, and democratic classroom leadership; use of sound principles of learning pertaining to motivation, reinforcement, transfer of training, and so on; little attention to age and grade as criteria for what to teach (as in nongraded, continuous progress plans); flexible use of personnel resources (as in team teaching); and clear evidence that we are in the "golden age of instructional materials." [9]

Unfortunately, too many of these characteristics have been blunted at the schoolhouse door, and it is difficult to find examples.

In the 70's we must insist on pedagogical scholarship comparable to the academic scholarship of the 60's without, of course, losing the latter. In the 70's a theoretical framework must precede everything else. The curriculum must be viewed as a whole rather than as bits and pieces. Finally, up-to-date curriculums must be designed that are honest and significant and are attractive and comprehensible to dull or poorly motivated as well as to bright children.

We seem to be moving, at least in the United States, in the following directions in curriculum reform:

FROM	TO
primary emphasis on academic scholarship	pedagogical and academic scholarship
involvement of only academic scholars and teachers	involvement of all levels of decision makers in the schools, including parents, students, and scholars, but with special emphasis on the participation of teachers
child-, society-, or discipline-centered curriculum	the total curriculum, the humanistic curriculum
selling prepackaged programs	truly experimental programs—pharmacies of tested educational alternatives (choices and options)
tinkering with the means of education	focus on ends, aims, objectives; the return of the philosopher to the center of the stage

FROM	TO
trying to teach everything	establishing priorities
focus on the gifted and the deprived student	focus on all students
bits and pieces; one course at a time	comprehensive school improvement programs (nursery school through college)
elementary and secondary reform only	higher education and adult education reform, too
in-service training of teachers	in-service education of teachers (continuing career development)

In *The Reform of Urban Schools*, which is part of the SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's Preliminary Series, Mario D. Fantini develops the following directions:

FROM	TO
a school climate in which the school plant calls attention to itself	one that calls attention to the student
isolated self-contained teaching	cooperative teaching
teaching geared to one learning style	teaching geared to many learning styles
abstract teaching	experience-based teaching
uniform pace and content	continuous diagnosing and regrouping
"what" curriculum (factual)	"why" curriculum (conceptual)
sporadic emphasis on ego development	systematic approaches to self-concept and black cultural identity
use of school resources	expanded use of the community
one path to a diploma	alternate paths to a diploma
suburban-trained teachers	urban-trained teachers [10]

Turning from substance, let us examine process. Several years ago I made an analysis of magazine articles, which revealed two principal categories—the How To Do It article and the Gee Whiz piece. There is certainly a plethora of advertisements today telling us how to do everything: how we can look younger, stay slimmer, sleep more soundly; how we can fly faster and farther and more safely; how we can change our hair color so only our hairdresser

will know; how we can make the driest martini. I am going to suggest another "how"—how we can translate these new ideas of curriculum reform into practice. One way to do this is, quite simply, by exhibiting leadership.

Leadership is a function, not a position or person. Leadership is concerned with how people can be brought together to work for common ends effectively and happily. Leadership is the ability to contribute to the achievement of those ends either through ideas or through ways of working to accomplish them. Leadership, unfortunately, is often confused with command—as the contest between the Japanese commander and the British colonel demonstrated in *The Bridge on the River Kwai*. Command, however, is always concerned with power over people, while leadership is concerned with power over problems.[11]

Mary P. Follett perhaps expresses such ideas more simply:

> When you and I decide on a course of action together and do that thing, you have no power over me nor I over you, but we have power over ourselves together. We have, however, no authority over John Smith. We could try to get "power" over him in a number of ways . . . but the only legitimate power we could have in connection with John Smith is what you and John Smith and I could develop together over our three selves. . . . Genuine power is power-with; pseudo power, power-over.[12]

There is no need to spell out the implications of Mary Follett's sound advice. It is enough to say again that leadership is a function—not a position or person.

If we can become effective leaders, we can begin to translate the new ideas of curriculum reform into practice. If we can establish a framework, a philosophy, and a set of goals, we can effectively judge proposals for curriculum innovation. If we can do these things, if we follow the words of Irvamae Applegate, who said, "If it is to be, it is up to me," we can make the schools effective warriors in America's struggle with the future.

And through it all, we must be able to see clearly what is necessary and what is possible. We might find guidance in Graham Greene's novel, *A Burnt-Out Case*, the fascinating story of an internationally known architect who spends the twilight of his life in a Congolese leper colony. He resists all the medals the priests and doctors wish to pin on him. He asks them not to project any noble motives into his mind and heart. He is there because he

has lost the capacity to love—architecture, women, everything. He is a burnt-out case. One evening he enters the following in his diary—an entry that applies to all of us and that we should consider thoughtfully as we put first things first, not last:

> A vocation is an act of love; it is not a professional career. When desire is dead one cannot continue to make love. I've come to the end of desire and to the end of a vocation. Don't try to bind me in a loveless marriage and to make me imitate what I used to perform with passion. And don't talk to me like a priest about my duty. A talent—we used to learn that lesson as children in scripture lessons—should not be buried when it still has purchasing power, but when the currency has changed and the image has been superseded and no value is left in the coin but the weight of a wafer of silver, a man has every right to hide it. Obsolete coins, like corn, have always been found in graves.[13]

What all this means for us is that we should neither be optimists nor pessimists, but possiblists—if we are not to be in graves while we are still alive.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Gardner, John W. "Education and the Great Society." *Addresses and Proceedings.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. pp. 31-34.

[2] Goodlad, John I. "Who Should Be in Charge: What Decisions by Whom?" Speech delivered April 27, 1970. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. (Unpublished.)

[3] Tyler, Ralph. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

[4] Cremin, Lawrence. *The Genius of American Education.* Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965. p. 31.

[5] *Time,* June 28, 1968. pp. 62-66.

[6] Menninger, William C. *Living in a Troubled World: Selections from the Writings of William C. Menninger.* Kansas City, Mo.: Hallmark Cards, 1967. pp. 46-59.

[7] Based on Ralph Tyler, *loc. cit.*

[8] See Goodlad, John I. "Direction and Redirection for Curriculum Change." *Curriculum Change: Direction and Process.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1966.

[9] Goodlad, John I. "Educational Change: A Strategy for Study and Action." *National Elementary Principal* 48: 7-8; January 1969.

[10] Fantini, Mario D. *The Reform of Urban Schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. pp. 73-89.

[11] Herrick, Virgil E. "The Principal Looks at Himself." *Educational Leadership* 4: 442-48; April 1947.

[12] Follett, Mary P. *Creative Experience.* New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1928. p. 199.

[13] Greene, Graham. *A Burnt-Out Case.* New York: Bantam Books, 1962. p. 46.

Essay 3
In Search of a New Bird

Are schools as we know them dying institutions? And by the end of this century will the demise be complete? Will the institutional-green coffin be buried and an appropriate tombstone raised? Could the stone well be engraved with Mark Twain's famous observation, "I never let my schooling interfere with my education"?

If schools die because they refuse to change, there will be little mourning among teachers—except for those few among us who take *themselves* so seriously that they look as if they were weaned on a pickle—because the passing will give change a chance. As Rubin says, "A teacher with no feeling is a tyrant; a teacher with no finesse is a catastrophe; a teacher with both is a miracle." [1]

The life of the teacher, for example, will change radically when the old institutions are finally laid to rest. For one thing, he will be more like a college professor than a day laborer. The college professor today teaches about 12 hours a week. His breathless counterpart in the elementary and the high school teaches about 30 hours a week with lesson planning, evaluation, and analysis sandwiched helter-skelter among policing playgrounds, monitoring cafeterias, chaperoning proms, overseeing extracurricular clubs, and attending those famous sessions of quivering in unison—faculty meetings, usually from 4 to 6 in the afternoon.

With the death of the old institutions all teachers will have—as indeed a few have now—realistic allocations of time for research, planning, and development. Some will have Thursdays for thinking. Some will have six weeks of school and one week of thinking, as was recently tried at UCLA's Elementary School. Others will have Tuesday and Thursday afternoons away from the classroom, as Newton, Mass., has done for several decades. Some will adapt Princeton's (N.J.) Wednesday Program, which enables teachers to work on projects related to professional growth and the improvement of the school system. Schools in Princeton

close every Wednesday at 1 p.m. Students choose what they want to do, and so do teachers.

There are many possibilities for reordering schedules, but the goal is the same: to move from a teaching schedule of 30 hours a week in class with children and 15 hours for planning and correcting to 15 hours a week in class with children and 30 hours for research, planning, and development.

The goal is not more time off for teachers. The goal is a different use of the teachers' time. And, with reordered schedules, the teacher will be able to make full use of new techniques in instruction—including team teaching and the use of machines. The teacher will need to break out of the confines of the two covers of a textbook, the four walls of a classroom, and the six periods of a school day.

Unfortunately, team teaching conjures up all manner of cooperative teaching ventures. The term does not mean "you take my history and I'll take your math." Team teaching is not, as it has been called when practiced badly, "two or more teachers horsing around in the same classroom." The term means that teachers are part of a carefully organized team that can follow a flexible schedule of working sometimes with an individual student, sometimes with a small discussion group of 10 to 12, and sometimes with a hundred or more. When this happens, the teacher moves from being a general practitioner to becoming a clinical specialist who works as part of a team.

To make the change from the walking, talking, all-knowing oracle to the specialist on a team, the teacher will obviously need more education himself. However, educators in the past have too frequently relied on mimeographed notices, bulletins, and an occasional meeting to pass on new techniques. We might be better served if we were to draw on the experience of the Department of Agriculture. The Department not only sends bulletins to farmers and calls them to meetings, but it also has agents who plant corn and put up peaches and then give demonstrations to the farmers and the farmers' wives. Supervisors should move from being inspectors to becoming educational demonstration agents.

If one recalls all the books written since the NEA SCHOOLS FOR THE 60's series with their predictions of amazing changes ahead and then looks at life in classrooms today, one finds that a funny thing happened on the way to the future. A useful cautionary exercise for the reader of these essays is to remember

the way teaching is as we look into the future. Silberman makes the point well:

> "What we call necessary institutions," Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, "are often no more than institutions to which we have grown accustomed." The "necessity" that makes American schooling so uniform over time and across cultures is simply the "necessity" that stems from unexamined assumptions and unquestioned behavior. The preoccupation with order and control, the slavish adherence to the timetable and lesson plan, the obsession with routine qua routine, the absence of noise and movement, the joylessness and repression, the universality of the formal lecture or teacher-dominated "discussion," in which the teacher instructs an entire class as a unit, the emphasis on the verbal and de-emphasis of the concrete, the inability of students to work on their own, the dichotomy between work and play—none of these is necessary, all can be eliminated.
>
> Schools can be humane and still educate well. They can be genuinely concerned with gaiety and joy and individual growth and fulfillment without sacrificing concern for intellectual discipline and development. They can be simultaneously child-centered and subject- or knowledge-centered. They can stress aesthetic and moral education without weakening the three R's. They can do all these things if—but only if—their structure, content, and objectives are transformed.[2]

But education is more than teachers—and the death of old institutions will bring many changes to other areas as well. Emphasis will shift, for example, from the group to the individual. Milk can be homogenized, but not children. We cannot pour 20 eight-year-olds into a classroom and expect them all to do the same thing or, more important, *want* to do the same thing.

As a result, grades will be eliminated and each student will advance upward at a rate and in a direction best suited to him. There will be more groups of mixed ages, and students themselves will occasionally serve as aides to the teaching staff and learn from each other. In short, schools will move from graded institutions to nongraded institutions.

At the same time, students will spend less time in the classroom and more time studying independently. The student will not have a teacher breathing down his neck all day long. He'll be "on his own," pursuing independent studies for as many as 12 hours a week. Exact schedules will vary, but a good average for students would be to change from 30 hours a week in class to 18 hours in

class and 12 in independent study, including activities outside school and in the converted classroom as well.

With students learning more on their own, a new bird will have to be found to symbolize American education—the parrot and the psittacotic method of teaching will no longer be appropriate. Sheer bulk defeats any effort to teach knowledge as a body of facts to be learned. Coverage is no longer difficult; it is impossible. The emphasis will have to shift from memory to inquiry, and at the same time, teachers will change from telling students to guiding them.

But make no mistake about it, it will still be the teacher who can move a child to the edge of his seat, eyes shining, hand raised before the question is completed. Seeing children that eager to learn is one way to determine if a school is any good. Another is to listen for good belly laughs coming from some classroom at least once every half hour. But no matter what you call it or how you find it, a new feeling will prevail in the schools of the future.

In much the same way, the old-style school buildings will give way to new designs. Too many classrooms look like kitchens. The kitchen atmosphere will be replaced by the pleasant environment found in rooms that look like libraries or living rooms—all carpeted and comfortable. In other instances, there will be no rooms at all, and schools will move from boxes and egg crates to clusters and zones of space. According to Harold B. Gores, "a schoolhouse is a big box filled with equal-sized little boxes called classrooms. . . . Their motif," he adds, "is dictated by a municipal desire to frustrate any errant scholar who, unsheathing his jackknife, might try to carve his initials in this ceramic vault the taxpayers have provided for his childhood. . . . The very architecture sorts the children. . . . It helps the administration to establish groups of uniform size—25 pupils if the community is rich, 35 if it is poor, and 50 if it doesn't care." [8]

Gores' cubical monstrosity will be replaced by open areas—areas to use for conversation, space to plant things, places where computers teach reading, math, and spelling. School may be a storefront or a multimillion-dollar high rise. Or it may be no building at all, but rather an organized program that allows children to study throughout the community, as is being done in Philadelphia's Parkway Program.

But, to the extent that the school exists as a building, it will shift from a schedule based on an agrarian society to one based on an urban society. An agrarian school is open nine months a

year. An urban school should be open year-round. An agrarian school is open only to children. An urban school should be open to everyone. As former President Johnson once noted, "We cannot afford to have an 85-billion dollar plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time."[4] Schools of the future will be open 12 months a year and at night. They will serve people of all ages. The prescribed starting age for school will probably be meaningless. "September madness," with weeping mothers and five-year-olds coming to school en masse, will be eliminated, and each child will begin school on his birthday with a birthday party. Then, truly individualized instruction can be fact rather than rhetoric.

And finally, in the school of tomorrow, teachers will become as critical of their own performance as children already are. Even now there are good tools for self-criticism in education, and there will be more. The teacher's classroom performance can be videotaped so that later he can see for himself how he did in a teaching situation.

There will be better ways for teachers to assess how children are performing, too. In fact, national educational indexes may well be as essential to our schools for the future as economic indexes are now to the businessman. It is absurd to suppose anyone should want to operate schools on the basis of ignorance rather than on the basis of information.

There will be a move away from colleges setting admission standards, and there will be more cooperation between colleges and high schools to develop valid evaluation techniques. There will be fewer paper-and-pencil tests and more continuous evaluation of the student's work, with the student himself taking part. In their time out of the classroom, local faculties will develop much more meaningful tools and instruments to assess progress than is possible with the current commercially prepared standardized tests.

While it is well known that any teacher who can be replaced by a machine should be, the organized teaching profession should welcome technology to do the dirty dishes of teaching. In the 70's, the teacher will use technology for the dispensing of information, and he will do the truly human tasks of the human teacher. Gores says it well:

> Machines for learning are being showered on education these days, and we've seen only the beginning. Within a year or two

there will be individual sound motion picture machines smaller than a bread box, lighter than a record player, cheaper than a microscope, capable of presenting single concepts in five or six minutes of motion, color, and the simultaneous voice of the best and wisest teacher. And there will be talking books, cassettes which will compress into the size of a package of cigarettes 90 minutes of anything worth listening to, with the added advantage of being copied at a rate approaching what Xerox can do with the printed word.

When this happens, and it's near, the teacher can rise to a higher calling. No longer burdened by the dispensing of so much information, the teacher will deal less with facts and more with values—the meaning of it all. At long last the teacher will have returned to his ancient trade—philosophy—what's true, what's false, what's moral, what's immoral, what's amoral, what's right, what's wrong.

Surprisingly, it is technology which will elevate the teacher to a higher plane of professionalism. For the competent teacher, the one who can inspire the child to understand America, love it, and love it while he reshapes it, technology holds not the threat of unemployment but the promise of professionalism.[5]

In summary, if schools of the 70's are to uphold America's promise, they will move in these directions:

FROM	TO
the group	the individual
the self-contained classroom	the community-wide school
school building use geared to an agrarian society with a nine-month year, limited to children	school building use reflecting urban society with a 12-month year, available to all age groups
2 X 4 X 6 teacher: stuck between 2 covers of a textbook, 4 walls of a classroom, 6 periods of a school day	the teacher and his staff: man, media, and machines
teaching as telling, dispensing information	teaching as guiding, conducting the dialogue
teacher as general practitioner	teacher as clinical specialist (member of team)
memory	inquiry
spiritless climate	zest for learning

FROM	TO
classrooms that are like kitchens	classrooms that are like libraries and living rooms
boxes and egg crates	clusters and zones of space
scheduled classes	appointments and independent learning
a teaching schedule of 30 hours a week in class with children and 15 hours for planning and correcting	15 hours a week with children and 30 hours of research, planning, and development
the graded school	the nongraded school
supervisors	educational demonstration agents
centralized, narrow-based decision making, conducted mainly by the "educational establishment"	decentralized, broadly based decision making, including students, teachers, parents, and others along with the "establishment"

All of these changes—from curriculum to school buildings to teacher preparation to new overall concepts—are important. But two principles, both of them given life by the death of the old institutions, are especially noteworthy. The first is that the teacher is not the source, but the catalyst. The other is that school is a concept, not a place; that education can happen anywhere—in a classroom, in a park, in a factory.

Hopefully, these changes will produce a curriculum and a style of teaching that will make no compromise with truth or significance and still prove attractive to the poorly motivated as well as to the "bright" youngster. Hopefully, these changes will give every student a zest for learning. When the history of the world is written, and the Greeks are remembered for liberty, the Romans for law, and the British for parliamentary government, perhaps we in the United States will be remembered as the first nation in the history of the world to take seriously the idea of universal public education. And our new bird will add the words "equal" and "quality" to this dream.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Rubin, Louis J. "Teaching: Feeling and Finesse." Paper delivered at Center for Coordinated Education Symposium on the Perennial Education of Teachers, Palo Alto, California, April 7, 1970. (Unpublished.)

[2] Silberman, Charles E. "Murder in the Schoolroom." *The Atlantic* 226: 83; July 1970.

[3] Gores, Harold B. Speech delivered at the 43rd annual convention of the New York State School Boards Association, 1962.

[4] Johnson, Lyndon Baines. "Acceptance of the American Education Award." *Your AASA in 1965-66.* (Proceedings of Annual Convention, February 1966.) Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1966. p. 191.

[5] Gores, Harold B. "Whipsaw." Speech delivered to the School Masters Rotary Club, Atlantic City, N.J., February 20, 1968.

Essay 4
How Much Does Gray Matter?

Like Cinderella, most humanists have been relegated to the chimney corner while their elder sisters clamor for the sunshine in the age of nuclear streamlining. I think the time has come to put the slipper on the right foot, and as a means of doing so, I will address these remarks to three questions:

First, how can the school provide a program appropriately balanced for the individual and maintain it amidst various pressures for specialization?

Second, how can schools make wise selections of content from the ever-growing body of available knowledge?

And third, what are the barriers to a humane environment in the schools, and what would result if the barriers were eliminated?

The NEA Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI) exists to help bring together the world of scholarship and the world of decision, for we are all painfully aware that the present quality of communication can stand much improvement. Would it not be exhilarating if we could make ourselves and our wares as dramatic as Beethoven's Fifth or *Hair* or even Steppenwolf? Or is there a more quiet way of doing our job?

If I were to attempt to present the work of CSI in capsule, I would say that we adhere to and support a rather fundamental belief that improvement of an educational program can and must be accomplished through rational planning of curriculum and instruction.

While rational planning is a point of view likely to raise few eyebrows among educators, it is an idea that bears repeating, since it rarely seems to command their continuing concern. The objective is to keep all of the forces that are brought to bear upon the humanistic, educational process squarely on target.

To this end, I shall attempt to spell out as best I can some directions in which education is going. The curriculum reform movement has dealt primarily with *what* to teach. I shall deal with two of several issues in that area—balance and content selection.

In today's world of breathtaking technological advancement, the all-important position once attributed to the humanities has been usurped by the sciences, and we are bequeathed a disturbing imbalance that threatens to leave today's student starved in the humanities. We are the sudden beneficiaries of the 50's and 60's, the TV-Sputnik-Sitdown-IBM-Mushroomcloud era, and, as Harry S. Broudy points out, ". . . many of us cannot escape the feeling that if we do wholly surrender our fates to the new gods, we may be saved *from* our humanity rather than *for* it." [1] F. S. C. Northrop, in a provocative and penetrating study, echoes this sentiment:

> Ours is a paradoxical world. The achievements which are its glory threaten to destroy it. The nations with the highest standard of living, the greatest capacity to take care of their people economically, the broadest education, and the most enlightened morality and religion exhibit the least capacity to avoid mutual destruction in war. It would seem that the more civilized we become the more incapable of maintaining civilization we are.[2]

Ask one of your students about the sun. What will he tell you? It is 93,000,000 miles from the earth, approximately 866,500 miles in diameter, with a surface rotation of about 25 days at the equator. If he is to live in the shadow of bigger and better bombs, perhaps he must be taught all these facts. Yet it will always be the larger purpose of education to lead him to appreciate the radiance of a sunset. G. K. Chesterton has something to say to this point:

> There is a notion adrift everywhere that imagination, especially mystical imagination, is dangerous to man's mental balance. Poets are commonly spoken of as psychologically unreliable; and generally there is a vague association between wreathing laurels in your hair and sticking straws in it. Facts and history utterly contradict this view. Most of the very great poets have been not only sane, but extremely businesslike; and if Shakespeare ever really held horses, it was because he was much the safest man to hold them. Imagination does not breed insanity. Exactly what does breed insanity is reason. Poets do not go mad; but chessplayers do. Mathematicians go mad, and cashiers; but creative artists very seldom. . . . Critics are much madder than poets.
>
> Homer is complete and calm enough; it is his critics who tear him into extravagant tatters. Shakespeare is quite himself; it is

only some of his critics who have discovered that he was somebody else. And though St. John the Evangelist saw many strange monsters in his vision, he saw no creature so wild as one of his own commentators. The general fact is simple. Poetry is sane because it floats easily in an infinite sea; reason seeks to cross the infinite sea, and so make it finite. The result is mental exhaustion, like the physical exhaustion of Mr. Holbein. To accept everything is an exercise, to understand everything a strain. The poet only desires exaltation and expansion, a world to stretch himself in. The poet only asks to get his head into the heavens. It is the logician who seeks to get the heavens into his head. And it is his head that splits.[3]

Science is not the panacea of life's problems. We must keep our debt to it in clear perspective. Its Nembutal helps us sleep; its wrinkle-resistant wash-and-wear clothes us; its steel beams support the great theaters. But the test tube has yet to come up with a shake-'n'-bake formula for increasing man's ability to think, to feel, to appreciate, to understand, to love. It is the task of the humanities to help us understand ourselves so we can understand our fellow men and to help us live in this valley of the dolls that science has fashioned for us.

The humanities, of course, must serve the schools in equipping today's students to make the best possible use of the greatest blessing to emerge from technology—the gift of leisure. The school shares this responsibility with other educational agencies. Incidentally, Dewey's disciples sometimes confuse his sound advice about schooling the whole child with nonsense about the school taking responsibility for the child's whole education. The school is still only one educational institution. We are not looking for perfect balance, of course. A little disequilibrium often produces people who are as exciting as Nina Simone, as productive as Thomas Aquinas or Martin Luther, and as imaginative and creative as Serge Koussevitzky.

The teacher who teaches with zest, who speaks and listens well, who helps his students interact with more than boredom or rebellion is a humanist, an artist working with humanity, and his art is the one thing in this pep-pill world of ours most likely to beget in his students a thirst, a passion for the fullness of life. Is there anything in our philosophy of education that requires the teacher to be a poor listener or speaker, alien to the sheer delight of being, fearful of his bright young students, and complete with fitful

mannerisms? Is it a blessing that too many articles in educational journals are completely devoid of style? Is Plato less for writing well? If Socrates had spoken badly, if he had not charmed his young listeners to a view of the world and a delight in their own unique being no matter what he was discussing at the moment, would we be richer? When a concept has reached such definition that it can be adequately expressed in jargon, it can then be taught much more efficiently by a machine.

The only reason that a teacher should be a person, alive to the things that are, is that he must encourage speculation and lead it. To help a student learn about an unknown and vastly different country requires a medium, a metaphor in which the known and the unknown can meet, each taking meaning from the other. Such a medium is the essence of music, of poetry, of art. Students taught by a real humanist will become real humanists, readers, listeners, men of intellectual and emotional delight, ready for a kind of intimacy with the world that will breed not contempt, but freedom of mind. These students will have a way out of the slavery of mere conformism to society. President Kennedy put it well:

> I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty.... which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft.... which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment.... which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens.[4]

However, there are many barriers to a humane environment in our schools. One is the school building itself—if it is the old-style, egg-crate-and-box design. Harold B. Gores revisited an elementary and middle school of modern open design and reported these observations by the school's principal:

> I don't know whether the kids test better or not, but I do observe that absenteeism of both staff and student body is less; that there is less tension, fewer tantrums, less vomiting, fewer confrontations. It's easier to get paraprofessionals and volunteers. They feel more comfortable joining a team in a large space than working in a square box about the size of a prize-fight ring, and already occupied by one professional. The open space provides room for withdrawal. In effect, both teachers and children can withdraw to the back country to cool off rather than slug it out in the ring.

> Education is a soft science and we'll have to await the hard data about achievement. I think it will be better, but I can't prove it now. But we're picking up human and humane benefits and economies which make it all worthwhile.[5]

There are other barriers—and many of them are much more difficult to correct than the unacceptable style of buildings. Rigid grouping, segmenting, and scheduling of learners, for example, are serious barriers to a humane environment in our schools. So are grading practices of the reward and punishment variety, as is the preoccupation with discipline, order, and control as conditions largely unrelated to the learning process.

Where attendance is compulsory, where the environment is closed and the culture test-oriented, or where authoritarian leadership exists, there is a barrier to humane environment.

Where there are few options for students, where an often irrelevant curriculum is imposed on them, where there is little understanding of their needs, interests, and problems, a humane environment cannot be created.

When the teacher dominates the learning process; when parents and the community set unimaginative expectations; when cultural value systems emphasize ends over means, material possessions, and economic ascendancy; and when those value conflicts go unresolved, there will be no humane environment.

When schools depend on college entrance requirements for setting standards, have improper systems of teacher education and certification, lack time for teachers to develop one-to-one relationships with students, and when there is little trust and faith within various components of the teaching profession, a humane environment cannot survive.

This collection of barriers is lengthy—but it is by no means complete. Arthur Combs, for example, developed some "myths about education" and each myth is a barrier to a humane environment:

1. *That there is such a thing as "grade-level,"* whether it refers to mental ability, chronological age, difficulty of content, level of achievement, or whatever.
2. *That grouping has value.* Research proves that grouping is only a convenient administrative device.
3. *That competition is good.* Competition is of interest only to those who have a chance of winning. It is not helpful to the losers, and at best it is of questionable value to the winners.

4. *That teachers should be neutral.* The notion that teachers should have no feelings, attitudes, or beliefs is an invalid one.
5. *That the teacher is an information provider.* The teacher should no longer be looked upon as a walking-talking oracle but rather as a conductor of the dialogue.
6. *That intelligence is fixed.* We know that intelligence can be created, which opens a whole new world of human possibilities. The great society is possible.
7. *That you cannot teach morality without religion.* We know that a caring, loving person can be developed outside the framework of organized religion, although organized religion can indeed be a supporting force to humaneness.
8. *That everyone should be treated alike.* The stubborn fact of individual differences is still with us.
9. *That learning is sequential.* The problem with step-by-step learning and studies of sequence is that people learn in the most maddening ways. Some want to learn last things first; others, the middle things last.
10. *That objectivity is desirable.* You cannot be objective unless something does not matter to you.
11. *That self-study leads to change.* People only change when they focus on how other people feel. To make myself a more lovable person, I must think about you, the family, the kids, the depressed in our society. The self is not changed by looking at self—not by looking at me.
12. *That there are any right methods.* The student usually can find better answers than the teacher. The notion that the doctor knows and the patient does not is invalid. Good doctors reverse that process. The patient knows; the doctor doesn't.
13. *That the proper model for education is the industrial or the medical model.* The scientific movement in education is here again with the systems people, the PPBS types.[6]

It's fair to ask, in light of these extended lists, what happens when the barriers come down. The answer is an awful lot. Learners in a humane environment are helped to develop self-actualizing behaviors through opportunities provided for decision making regarding their own learning; understand that the principles of discipline, order, and control are largely self-regulatory and rooted in rational commitment to self and to one's group; evaluate their own learning behavior in consultation with teachers; value

the diversity that exists in and between groups of people; understand and resolve value conflicts; relate positively to the school, the community, and the greater society; make decisions about their own temporal destinies; and consider the school as a vital component of the community.

Teachers in a humane learning environment promote variance and flexibility in grouping schemes for learners; value the learner as a central decision maker in schools; provide multiple options for learning opportunities; value divergent behavior of learners and colleagues; understand and use community resources as educational experiences for learners; promote one-to-one relationships with learners; behave toward colleagues with trust and honesty; help learners become what they *can* become and then maintain and sustain that condition; promote true two-way communication between school and community; and use technology as an adjunct to, not substitute for, human contact.

In addition to these factors of the humane environment, one more thing is required. Singer Aretha Franklin poses the crucial question:

> Has it got soul? Man, that's the question of the hour. If it has soul, then it's tough, beautiful, out of sight. It passes the test of withitness . . . But what is soul? It's like electricity. "We don't really know what it is," says Ray Charles, "but it's a force that can light a room." The force radiates from a sense of knowing where you've been and what it means. Soul is a way of life—but it is always the hard way. Its essence is ingrained in those who suffer and endure to laugh about it later.[7]

The final issue I should like to touch on briefly concerns the selection of content. Never before have the forces of change spun with such incredible speed. In the nearly 2,000 years since the birth of Christ, there has been first a very slow and then a rapidly accelerating growth in the accumulation of knowledge. The first time since the year 1 that man's accumulated knowledge of his world doubled was in 1750. It redoubled 150 years later; then again 50 years later; then again 10 years later. Therefore, teachable material has doubled twice since I was a student at the University of Chicago.

So much has been learned that, as the Red Queen in *Alice in Wonderland* complains, ". . . it takes all the running you can do, just to keep in the same place." Because of this explosion of

knowledge, the problems of what to learn require a vastly different approach today. We must move from an overemphasis on memorization of facts toward discovery of facts. The cyclamate-free generation nourished by Apollo and *Sesame Street* and *Ramparts* will not settle for the old prepackaged pap. Art must spark the realization of quantity and relationship and convergence, the way Walt Disney did it. Literature must be the open-sesame to the dignities and depravities of man's striving, the way *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* does it. Music must open the boy and release the man locked inside.

Important national curriculum studies are becoming as commonplace as cocktails before dinner. They spring from the urgent need for bringing the school curriculum up to date—incorporating the useful and discarding the obsolete. Here are some of the recommendations of the NEA's National Committee for the Project on Instruction on what schools should do in the selection of content:

1. The objectives of the school, with a clear statement of priorities, should give a direction to all curriculum planning. This applies to adding content, eliminating content, or changing the emphases on various topics and fields of study.
2. The curriculum must undergo close and continuing re-evaluation, in the light of new knowledge. Everyone can contribute to this Herculean task—the teacher, the school administrator, the scholar, the informed citizen, the student.
3. The results and recommendations of curriculum projects sponsored by nationally-oriented groups must be studied by local school teachers who will glean and use promising findings.[8]

There is a real need for a systematic procedure for studying the results of these curriculum projects—a procedure that honors the importance of balance and continuity in the total school experience of students. No system will be complete unless it allows for change, when change is needed.

In conclusion, let me urge all teachers to be a little reckless. Intercourse with the arts, humanities, and music should make a man promiscuous. We need disequilibrium in ourselves as well as in our curriculum. Teachers must show students that they are real humanists—people eager to "go and catch a falling star" (Donne), "to touch, taste, savor, and be stung" (Buckley)—that they are people who hunger for loveliness.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Broudy, Harry S. "Aesthetic Education in a Technological Society: The Other Excuses for Art." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 1: 13; Spring 1966.

[2] Northrop, F. S. C. *The Meeting of East and West.* New York: Collier Books, 1966. p. 1.

[3] Chesterton, G. K. *Orthodoxy.* New York: Image Books, 1959. pp. 16-18.

[4] Kennedy, John F. "Remarks at Amherst College upon Receiving an Honorary Degree." *Public Papers of the President: John F. Kennedy, 1963.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 817.

[5] Gores, Harold B. "Schools in the 70's: The Case of the Relevant Schoolhouse." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 54: 137-38; May 1970.

[6] Based on the author's notes from Combs, Arthur. "Humanizing the Education of Children." A speech to the Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education Luncheon, San Francisco, Calif., March 17, 1970.

[7] *Time,* June 28, 1968. pp. 62-66.

[8] National Education Association, Project on Instruction. *Schools for the Sixties.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963. pp. 50, 51, and 55.

Essay 5
Entrances and Exits

In this blood-soaked and violent age, we are facing many conflicts—poverty *vs.* affluence, young *vs.* old, law and order *vs.* permissiveness, improving life at home *vs.* improving life abroad, the new morality *vs.* the old dogma. Arguments about the who and how of decision making, the dimension and design of relevant instructional programs, and the unique role of the school have pitted student against teacher, black against white, parent against parent, teacher against administrator.

This essay will touch upon some of the issues and challenges that await solution during the 70's—the revolt of the students, racial unrest in the schools, the rise of parent and teacher power, the urban educational crisis, the community school, and vocational education.

As every headline reader knows, student unrest reached fever pitch in the late 60's. Students protested—often violently—against the kind of curriculum that, from their point of view, was remote from life in the latter half of the twentieth century. Significantly, before they marched, staged a sit-in, or took over the PA system, they pinned on buttons reading, "I am a human being; do not fold, spindle, or mutilate." They were telling their elders rudely, and at the tops of their voices, that they were rejecting the role of captive audience. They were fed up with being consumers without choice or voice in schools supposedly designed for them.

College students were the first dissenters, but the movement quickly spread to the lower levels of education. A survey made recently by the National Association of Secondary School Principals revealed that 59 percent of the respondents (secondary schools) had already experienced some form of student protest and 56 percent of the junior highs polled had seen students on the march.

Dissatisfaction with the school program, including the teachers, the curriculum, the scheduling, homework, grading, and testing, accounted for student unrest in 45 percent of the schools responding. Students seemed to be asking for learning based on their

own living—for a curriculum that will confront the facts of war, racism, riots, and urban decay and will help them to find remedies for these societal ills as well as answers to the urgent perennial questions: Who am I? Where am I going? [1]

Black students took the protest route, too, to demonstrate that they no longer intended to remain ignorant of their own identity, pride, and culture. The justice of their complaints hit home in many schools during the 60's. Courses in soul music and Swahili, black history and black culture began to multiply. Textbook publishers rushed to the presses with new books designed to make amends for years of neglect of the Negro's contributions to American history.

Student power cannot be ignored, laughed out of existence, or swept under the rug.

Parent power has been burgeoning, too, in the late 60's, and from an unexpected quarter—the ghetto. Poverty area and minority group parents were hotly protesting the dismal statistical truth that the longer their children stayed in school, the further behind they fell. These parents began seeking the same control over their children's education that they believed suburban parents exercised. Decentralization and community control became their rallying cries.

In early 1970, a national advisory committee appointed by former HEW Secretary Robert Finch and headed by Wilson Riles, deputy superintendent of the California Department of Public Instruction, issued a report that spelled out what urban parents and teachers had known for quite a while—urban schools weren't doing the job.

"Parts of the Riles Report are familiar," *The New Republic* reported.

> . . . The cities are losing the affluent middle class, while their decaying centers fill up with the poor who need costly social services. But it also explains things many people don't understand: why big city schools are more expensive to run than schools elsewhere; how many archaic state aid formulas, written in the days when city schools were disproportionately wealthy, discriminate against the cities by giving them less per capita than suburbs; how the collapse of the parochial schools adds to city burdens. It draws a stark picture of decay and deterioration, with worse to come as city voters turn down bond issue after bond issue and the poor rise up against the institutions that fail their youngsters.[2]

Another group of parents is also dissatisfied with the schools. Dorothy Rich in the *Washington Post* on April 19, 1970, wrote that "unlike ghetto parents, . . . affluent parents are not angry because their kids are not learning to read. By and large, their children are reading and probably would even if they didn't go to school. . . . They want schools that encourage rather than discourage children and an atmosphere in school that says yes to life. It's no secret that schools, overall, have notoriously failed in this."

Urban parents demanded—and in some instances got—control of their schools. In some cases, community control became a bitterly contested end in itself. But in others it was only a step toward a cooperative restructuring that involved all segments of the school community.

Experiment in widespread community participation in schools has not always been welcomed, as we have seen in Brooklyn's Ocean Hill-Brownsville District. The Morgan Community School and the Anacostia Community Demonstration District, both in Washington, D.C., have, on the other hand, been able to make some headway in involving the community in the schools. Each has a community board to determine school policy. Boston and Chicago have also begun to experiment with citizen participation and the use of external resources. (Antioch College, for example, worked for a period of time with the Washington, D.C., Board of Education to operate the Morgan School.)

Syracuse's (N.Y.) Madison Area, a typical urban "ghetto," initiated a pilot project in 1962 that lasted for three years. The Madison Area Project, with the help of a Ford Foundation grant, was successful in its experiment with compensatory education that involved the school and the community as well. At the end of the project the children's performance in academic skills had greatly improved, and perhaps most important, many programs developed during the project were assimilated into the Syracuse school system. One of the most interesting and most important of these programs was the Urban Teacher Preparation Program, meant to train liberal arts graduates in the cross-cultural skills necessary to work effectively with disadvantaged children and poor schools.[3] The Madison Area Project was an experiment in urban education that has real ramifications for all urban school systems looking for reform.

Mario Fantini notes:

> The participants who lead reform in the 70's will be those closest to the action—teachers, parents, students. Participation

of these three publics in the governance of urban schools carries the potential for triggering change in substance and personnel. If all that were to happen under this new participatory movement should be a shift in control, so that a new group controlled the schools as an end in itself, the educational institution would remain outdated. The hope, however, is that those seeking control will use their political energy to set in motion the search for institutional renewal at the local school level, where it counts.[4]

Teachers have begun to use political power. Teacher strikes, unheard of before the early 60's, have become commonplace. Teachers have gained visibility and bargaining power. As a result of this newly found muscle, salaries have risen and working conditions have improved. The power of teachers in negotiation has, in many cases, not touched several important areas. One of these is the area of instructional improvement—a major focus of the 70's. One possibility for negotiation in instruction is the formation and utilization of active and responsive instructional improvement centers at the level of the local association—at the level of the teacher himself. To use an example, in Michigan, the Lansing Schools Education Association and the Lansing Board of Education have already contracted a process for instructional change through the establishment of an Instructional Council. The Council, made up of twelve administrators, twelve teachers (selected by the Association), and six parents (selected by the Lansing PTA), acts as a decision-making body for curricular and instructional development. In negotiation, the teaching profession will, of course, avoid the danger of engraving too much in stone—the danger of negotiating away their freedom to experiment, their freedom to make mistakes, their freedom to change their minds. The power of negotiation is a positive force that will be used to make essential reforms and will not be used to foster obsolescence. Negotiation is, in my opinion, a potentially strong, supporting force toward making schools work. I hope many local associations will actually run a school to prove that change can be made by the organized profession rather than by private, commercial, money-making companies.

The NEA, through its Professional Development and Instructional Services area, has worked with a number of pilot locals to help them take the lead in instructional improvement. In a forthcoming volume by Robert McClure in the SCHOOLS FOR THE

70's Preliminary Series, to be entitled *Field Studies in Curriculum Development,*[5] the CSI Field Studies Program will be described and analyzed. This Program helps increasing numbers of local associations meet the growing demand of teachers to be significantly involved in the planning of the curriculum and in the development of strategies to make schooling more responsive to the needs of students and society. These field studies have stimulated greater involvement of teachers in curricular and instructional decision making, more accurate information about presently operating educational activities, better articulation among and between levels of schooling, increased participation in school matters by community members and students, and more careful attention to the essential elements of good schools.

In addition to the teacher's taking leadership as a member of his professional association, he also has worked as a member of his school faculty to confront and take important steps toward institutional renewal. Storefront schools sprang up in Harlem, and education became something very real for young men and women whose world was the ghetto streets and alleys. Walt Whitman High School in wealthy Montgomery County, Md., started an Experiment in Free-Form Education that illustrated student leadership rather than student power. But probably the most dramatic and far-reaching innovation happened in Philadelphia, where superintendent of schools Mark Shedd created a marvel of urban education.

On January 23, 1970, William K. Stevens wrote an article in the *New York Times* describing Philadelphia's "School Without Walls." The article and the program it described are worth noting:

> About a year ago, amid great fanfare, high hopes and some skepticism, the Philadelphia school system initiated one of the Nation's boldest experiments in public education, the Parkway Program, in which high school students choose their own subjects of study and use the city's institutions and businesses as classrooms.
>
> The program was designed as an alternative means of education for teenagers who find conventional schools repressive and oppressive, and conventional instruction dull and unrelated to their own concerns. It is directed toward students who want to attend college and those who do not.
>
> Many of [the program's] supporters—especially students and parents—feel that the high hopes are mostly being fulfilled.

"For the first time," said one parent, "[my son] is actually being educated. He has learned more in his first session than in all his previous years of school. For the first time he likes school."

But many of the approving parents have reservations, often centering on whether the program deals adequately with basic skills like reading and writing and basic disciplines like history and science. Final judgment, in most quarters, is therefore being deferred.

So attractive has been the program's inherent freedom, however, that more than 10,000 students applied for the 500 places open this year. Partly because of this response, other cities are considering the merits of the program.

Essentially, the philosophy behind the Parkway Program is that people learn only what they want to learn, not what someone else imposes on them, and that they learn best by grappling directly with the rich material in the world around them.

"School is not a place, but an activity, a process," says John Bremer, the 42-year-old British-born director of the program. He further conceives of school as "a service organization" whose function is to help the student as he pursues his own self-initiated learning scheme.

The Parkway Program "is an attempt to break down the dichotomy between living and learning, and to that extent it's extremely significant," says Mario Fantini, who has been monitoring the project for the Ford Foundation. The foundation helped the program to get started with a $100,000 grant.

The whole point of the Parkway Program is that schooling and education are not synonymous, that the school building is not always necessary or desirable. Art classes meet at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, English classes at the Free Library of Philadelphia, chemistry at the Academy of Science, journalism at the *Philadelphia Inquirer.*

The "School Without Walls" concept is an important approach in improving urban schools. There are, however, several other ideas that also merit consideration.

Former U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II suggests other ways schools and business could work together:

Space might be made available in ghetto schools for such commercial establishments as grocery stores and beauty parlors, thereby providing new services to the community, part-time job

opportunities to the students and extra revenue for the school system.

School systems might subsidize local craftsmen—for example potters, silversmiths, painters and printers—by providing rent-free space in the schools with the proviso that they conduct a class or two in their specialty each day.[6]

To make the best use of our schools, to put suggestions for school-community cooperation to work, we've got to think of our school buildings in a whole new way. It is absurd that an urban school building is used on an outmoded schedule organized to fit the needs of an agrarian society. It is absurd that most school buildings are used only nine months out of the year. If schools are to change to meet the needs of urban America, school buildings must be in use all day, every day, 12 months a year, and their facilities must be available to people of all ages—night and day.

We also need to restructure the urban school so that no student is confronted with the rigid alternative of either being in school full-time or out of school altogether. Today, it is almost universal practice to require every boy and girl to be full-time matriculating students, without regard to individual needs and interests and problems, and to offer part-time programs to youngsters only when they have encountered such social disasters as pregnancy or jail. What we need to develop is a range of options, both in attendance requirements and in the kinds of programs that lead to a diploma.

One of the most neglected of these options is vocational education. All schooling contributes in one way or another to improve an individual's ability to choose a career wisely, to help an individual assume an adult role, and to enable him to contribute to and benefit from the community of which he is a part. Vocational education has, in the past, been generally considered second-rate, a one-way street leading to a dead end for children who can't make it in academics. Once a child is placed in a vocational "track," the door to a variety of options for him is basically closed. A child's early failure may simply mean that he is, for example, nonverbal, that his learning style is not one that is generally recognized as valuable, or that his style, simply, is one to which the school program or the teacher is unable to adapt.

There are basic skills that all learners should probably master; among them are language, numbers, problem solving, and interaction with individuals and groups. But if a child learns math through finding out how a simple machine works, that child will

have learned more than just math. Conversely, an academically oriented child learns through the same process some essentials of life outside the classroom.

Young people and adults everywhere are demanding work that has meaning. If the relationship between the abstract and the tangible is a part of schooling from the beginning, career choices will have solid bases in experience. School must enable all learners to gain experience with reality. There is no reason why a student, any student, cannot get school credit for a part-time job if it broadens his life experience. Nor is there any reason to deny the abstract to a child who learns by doing. It is time to phase out our archaic "credential" society, where one's formal schooling is more important than what he can do.

In short, there should be only two exits from school—one to additional education, the other to employment. It's time to seal off forever the door that leads nowhere.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Trump, J. Lloyd, and Hunt, Jane. "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 53: 150-58; May 1969.

[2] *The New Republic* 162: 10; March 21, 1970.

[3] Fantini, Mario D. *The Reform of Urban Schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. pp. 71-90.

[4] Fantini, Mario D. "Schools for the 70's: Institutional Reform." *Today's Education* 59: 60; April 1970.

[5] McClure, Robert M. *Field Studies in Curriculum Development.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction. (Scheduled to be published in 1971.)

[6] Howe, Harold, II. "The Strength of a Sparrow." *Picking Up the Options.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968. p. 229.